

1 Steve Salvador Ybarra
 2 Pro Se Litigant
 3 Minnesota | California
 4 TheoryWerkx.com
 5 Tel: 612.544.4380
 6 Steve@TheoryWerkx.com

7

8

9 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
 10 **FOR THE DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA**

11

12 Steve Salvador Ybarra
 13 Self-Represented
 14 Pro Se Litigant,

15 Plaintiff,

16 v.

17 Legal Assistance of Dakota County;
 18 Sharon Jones Esq., in her Individual and
 19 Official capacities;
 20 Hon. David Lutz, in his individual and
 21 Official capacities;
 22 Hon. Tanya Obrien, in her individual and
 23 official capacities;
 24 Hon. Dannie L Edwards, in her individual
 25 and official capacities;
 26 Lydia Clemens, in her individual and
 27 official capacities;
 28 Michelle Cathleen Ybarra,

Defendants.

No. . 0:25-cv-01948-KMM-DJF

**MEMORANDUM OF LAW IN SUPPORT
OF PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR
PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION**

INTRODUCTION

25 This memorandum supports Plaintiff Steve Salvador Ybarra's motion for a preliminary injunction
 26 pursuant to Rule 65(a) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. This case arises from systemic
 27 due process violations, sealed evidence concealment, and entrenched judicial bias in Dakota

RECEIVED
 MAY 14 2025
 CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT
 MINNEAPOLIS, MINNESOTA

SCANNED
 MAY 14 2025 *AC*
 U.S. DISTRICT COURT MPLS

1 County Family Court Case No. 19AV-FA-24-839. The relief requested is necessary to halt
2 ongoing constitutional injury, preserve the integrity of this federal forum, and restore Plaintiff's
3 access to an impartial adjudicatory process.

4

5 **LEGAL STANDARD**

6 A preliminary injunction is appropriate where the movant demonstrates: (1) a likelihood of
7 success on the merits; (2) a threat of irreparable harm in the absence of relief; (3) that the balance
8 of equities tips in the movant's favor; and (4) that an injunction is in the public interest. *Winter v.*
9 *Nat. Res. Def. Council, Inc.*, 555 U.S. 7, 20 (2008); *Dataphase Sys., Inc. v. CL Sys., Inc.*, 640 F.2d
10 109, 113 (8th Cir. 1981) (en banc).

12

13 **ARGUMENT**

14 **I. PLAINTIFF IS LIKELY TO SUCCEED ON THE MERITS**

15 **A. Procedural Due Process Violations (U.S. Const. Amend. XIV)**

16 Plaintiff has been denied fundamental fairness in state court proceedings. Custody determinations
17 have been made without findings of unfitness or danger. Sealed affidavits, concealed Legal Aid
18 intake records, and denial of discovery form a procedural regime that violates the core principles
19 articulated in *Mathews v. Eldridge*, 424 U.S. 319 (1976), and *Goldberg v. Kelly*, 397 U.S. 254
20 (1970). No evidentiary hearing has been granted despite four Rule 60.02(d) motions citing fraud.

21 **B. Fraud Upon the Court (*Hazel-Atlas Glass Co. v. Hartford-Empire Co.*, 322 U.S. 238
22 (1944))**

23 Fraud was committed when Defendant Sharon Jones submitted ghostwritten affidavits on behalf
24 of Michelle Ybarra, grounded in knowingly false indigency certifications. These affidavits
25 formed the basis for public representation by LADC, which has since been shielded by sealed
26 orders. *Hazel-Atlas* clearly establishes that fraud perpetrated through legal filings and concealed
27

1 via judicial sealing warrants federal equitable relief.

2 **C. Disqualification and Judicial Bias (Caperton v. A.T. Massey Coal Co., 556 U.S. 868**
3 **(2009))**

4 Judge Lutz has admitted on record to prior professional affiliation with LADC, yet refuses to
5 recuse. The standard for disqualification is not actual bias but "a serious risk of actual bias" where
6 past affiliations would cause a reasonable observer to question neutrality. *Caperton*, 556 U.S. at
7 884. When a judge rules on motions that protect a party he previously served, the presumption of
8 impartiality collapses.

9
10 **D. Jurisdictional Defect Under UCCJEA (Minn. Stat. § 518D.201(a)(1))**

11 Minnesota lacked home state jurisdiction over the children under the Uniform Child Custody
12 Jurisdiction and Enforcement Act (UCCJEA) at the time the petition was filed. The children
13 resided in California with Plaintiff until shortly before proceedings commenced. Jurisdiction
14 cannot be waived by appearance or counterpetition. See *H.M.B. v. E.T.M.*, No. A21-1174, 2022
15 WL 897216 (Minn. Ct. App. Mar. 28, 2022). Any orders issued without jurisdiction are void ab
16 initio.

17
18 **E. Conflict of Interest and Obstruction by Legal Aid**

19 LADC, a publicly funded entity, accepted Michelle Ybarra as a client despite income in excess of
20 qualifying limits. It continues to represent her while concealing its intake practices behind sealed
21 orders. Discovery obstruction regarding her financial eligibility constitutes both material litigation
22 fraud and an ethical breach under *Dennis v. Sparks*, 449 U.S. 24 (1980).

23
24
25 **II. PLAINTIFF FACES IRREPARABLE HARM**

26 Without intervention, Plaintiff will suffer ongoing deprivation of his fundamental right to parent
27 his children. *Troxel v. Granville*, 530 U.S. 57, 65 (2000). Courts routinely hold that violations of
28

1 constitutional rights, especially parental liberty interests, constitute irreparable harm. See *Elrod v.*
2 *Burns*, 427 U.S. 347, 373 (1976).

3 Moreover, the state forum has demonstrated entrenchment—denying all meaningful review of
4 Plaintiff's fraud and due process claims. This denial of access to a neutral tribunal justifies
5 injunctive intervention. See *Mitchum v. Foster*, 407 U.S. 225 (1972).

7

8 **III. THE BALANCE OF EQUITIES AND PUBLIC INTEREST FAVOR INJUNCTION**

9 Plaintiff has no adequate remedy at law. He has been forced to invest time, money, and litigation
10 resources to confront a judicial forum that is actively insulating misconduct. The equities weigh
11 in favor of pausing a tainted process to ensure federal review. Moreover, the public interest is
12 served by preserving the legitimacy of the judicial process and curbing sealed litigation fraud.
13 See *Pulliam v. Allen*, 466 U.S. 522 (1984) (judicial immunity does not bar prospective relief in
14 civil rights actions).

15 Judge Lutz's courtroom remarks—dismissing federal filings as 'hypothetical'.

17

18 **CONCLUSION**

19 For the foregoing reasons, Plaintiff respectfully requests this Court grant his motion for
20 preliminary injunction, preserve the status quo, and prevent further irreparable harm.

21 Plaintiff invokes the full equitable authority of this Court under *Pulliam v. Allen*, 466 U.S. 522
22 (1984), which authorizes prospective injunctive relief against judicial officers engaged in ongoing

24

25

26

27

28

1 constitutional violations. Plaintiff does not seek damages—but federal intervention to halt
2 unlawful custody restrictions, discovery suppression, and forum bias.

3

4

5

6

Respectfully submitted,

7

8

/s/ Steve Salvador Ybarra

9

Steve Salvador Ybarra

10

Pro Se Litigant

11

California | Minnesota

12

Email: Steve@TheoryWerx.com

13

Phone: (612) 544-4380

14

15

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

16

I hereby certify that on **May 12, 2025**, I served a true and correct copy of the attached:

17

MEMORANDUM OF LAW IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR

18

PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION

19

20

upon the following parties by email and/or U.S. Mail:

21

- **Legal Assistance of Dakota County**

22

Email: admin@dakotalegal.org

23

- **Sharon Jones, Esq.**, in her individual and official capacities

24

Legal Assistance of Dakota County

25

Email: sjones@dakotalegal.org

26

- **Hon. David Lutz**, in his individual and official capacities

27

Dakota County District Court

28

1560 Highway 55, Hastings, MN 55033

1 Email: Raymond.mestad@courts.state.mn.us

2 • **Hon. Tanya O'Brien**, in her individual and official capacities

3 Dakota County District Court

4 1560 Highway 55, Hastings, MN 55033

5 Email:

6 • **Hon. Danna L. Edwards**, in her individual and official capacities

7 Dakota County District Court

8 1560 Highway 55, Hastings, MN 55033

9 Email:

10 • **Lydia Clemens**, Guardian ad Litem, in her individual and official capacities

11 First Judicial District GAL Program

12 Email: Lydia.clemens@courts.state.mn.us

13 • **Michelle Cathleen Ybarra**, Respondent

14 Email: shellbel1@hotmail.com

15 This notice was served to all named parties via email where available and U.S. Mail where
16 necessary, consistent with Fed. R. Civ. P. 5(b) and Local Rule 7.1.

17 Respectfully submitted,

18 /s/ **Steve Salvador Ybarra**

19 Pro Se Litigant

20 Steve@TheoryWerxx.com

21 (612) 544-4380

22 Executed May 12, 2025

23

24

25

26

27

28